IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 766 of 1992

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE N.G.NANDI

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned Magistrate/Magistrates,Judge/Judges,Tribunal/Tribunals? : NO

VARADARAJ VELLU VAKANDY

Versus

GUJARAT UNIVERSITY

Appearance:

1. Special Civil Application No. 766 of 1992

MR YN OZA for Petitioner No. 1

MR SN SHELAT for Respondent No. 1

RULE SERVED for Respondent No. 2

MR KC SHAH for Respondent No. 3

SERVED BY RPAD - (R) for Respondent No. 4

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE N.G.NANDI

Date of decision: 04/07/2003

ORAL JUDGEMENT

1. Heard Mr. B.P. Gupta for Mr. Y.N. Oza for the petitioner, Ms. N.D. Mehta for Mr. SN Shelat for respondent University and Mr. K.C. Shah for the State.

2. Vide interim order dated 24-2-1992 the petitioner having been eligible candidate for being given admission to the course of M.S. (Radio-Diagnosis) course for the year 1992, subject to result of this petition, directed the respondent to give admission for M.S. (Radio-Diagnosis) for the term commencing from 1-1-1992 on Central Government quota of 1992. It is stated by Mr. Gupta that, pursuant to the aforesaid interim order petitioner was given admission for M.D. (Radio-Diagnosis) course for the term commencing from 1-1-1992 on the Central Government quota of 1992. Since the petitioner was directed to be given admission for M.D. (Radio-Diagnosis) course for the term commencing from 1-1-1992 on the Central Government quota of 1992, it appears that the petitioner must have either successfully or unsuccessfully completed his M.D. course, and therefore, the petition having become infructuous, is required to be disposed of accordingly.

3. In the result, petition is dismissed, as nothing further appears required. Rule discharged. Interim relief granted earlier stands vacated. Rule discharged. No costs.

Dt: 4-7-2003 (N.G. Nandi, J)

/vgn